

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application. No. : 10/537,504  
Applicant : Reinhold MEIER  
Filed : 11/30/2005  
TC/A.U. : 3673  
Examiner : Gilbert Y. Lee

Confirmation No. 4533

Docket No. : 011235.56348US  
Customer No. : 23911

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on May 24, 2007, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's requirement for restriction. The Examiner argues that the claims of Group I that are drawn to a honeycomb seal, i.e., claims 15-31, and the claims of Group II that are drawn to a method for manufacturing a honeycomb seal, i.e., claims 32-40, do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features. The Examiner argues that they do not disclose the same or corresponding special technical features because WIPO Pub. No. 01/30520 A1 discloses powder metallurgical injection molding.

Applicant respectfully submits that both Groups of claims relate to a single general inventive concept since both groups are directed to manufacturing a honeycomb seal by powder metallurgical injection molding. Merely because WIPO Pub. No. 01/30520 may disclose powder metallurgical injection molding, this does not mean that Applicant's invention does not define over this reference. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have not yet been substantively examined by the Examiner and, thus, Applicant has not been provided with any arguments by the Examiner regarding his substantive examination of the claims.


Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it is improper to argue that the two Groups do not include a single general inventive concept, i.e., manufacturing a honeycomb seal by powder metallurgical injection molding. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his unity of invention restriction requirement and examine all of the pending claims in the application.

However, in order to file a complete reply to this Restriction Requirement, as required in the Requirement, Applicant elects the invention of Group I, i.e., claims 15-31 drawn to a honeycomb seal, for further prosecution in this application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should the Examiner have any questions concerning this Paper. Applicant does not believe that any fees are required in connection with this Paper, however, the Office is authorized to charge any fees required to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket No. 011235.56348US).

Respectfully submitted,  
CROWELL & MORING LLP

Dated: June 22, 2007

By   
Robert L. Grabarek, Jr.  
Reg. No. 40,625  
Tel.: (949) 263-8400 (Pacific Coast)

Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, D.C. 20044-4300